

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re R.S., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

B217342

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. NJ22979)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

R.S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Gibson Lee, Judge. Affirmed.

Marta I. Stanton, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

The juvenile court sustained a one-count petition alleging the minor R.S. committed second degree robbery (Pen. Code, 211).

According to the evidence at the jurisdiction hearing, on the evening of April 13, 2009, the minor and two companions began walking behind two boys, Jose M. and Alexander V. The minor stopped the boys and asked to see Jose M.'s skateboard. After examining the skateboard, the minor returned it. The minor's companions then approached. One companion grabbed the skateboard and the other took Jose M.'s hat, before they fled with the minor.

The minor testified in his defense that his companions had planned to take the skateboard and the hat, but the minor had refused to participate or in any way assist in committing the robbery. The minor admitted he had approached the boys first, but only because he was interested in skateboarding and wanted to see Jose M.'s skateboard. The minor ran from the scene, because he did not want to be there if the police were called.

The juvenile court found the minor's testimony was not credible and sustained the petition.

At the disposition hearing, the minor was declared a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) and ordered into suitable placement. The court calculated the maximum physical confinement as not to exceed eight years.

We appointed counsel to represent the minor on appeal. After examination of the record counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On November 2, 2009, we advised the minor he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied the minor's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order is affirmed.

**WOODS, Acting P. J.**

**We concur:**

**ZELON, J.**

**JACKSON, J.**